



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,331	06/13/2001	Karen Eleanor Board	P3016	7159

24739 7590 10/18/2005

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY  
PO BOX 187  
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/881,331	Applicant(s) BOARD ET AL.	
	Examiner Ajay M. Bhatia	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/26/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The majority of applicants argument are directed to the template used is a "format specified by the user in the template" which would be used for a specific Internet device, but applicant has failed to claim these feature in the limitations. Applicant has amended to include "configuring at least part of the user profile for that user's Internet-capable appliance, enabling the system to send data for display to the user in the required format of the Internet-capable device" as currently interpreted by the limitation does not current reflect that arguments the applicant has made in the remarks. Applicant argues the template is to format of the device, Langseth provides for a device which excepts HTML which Fields provides. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Palm or the Motorola Elite Advisor and "format specified by the user") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Should applicant which to claims these features they should be amended into the claims limitations.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-67, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langseth et al. (U.S. Patent 6,662,195, referred to as Langseth) in view of Fields et al. (U.S. Patent 6,539,420, referred to as Fields).

2. For claim 43, Langseth teaches, a network-based system for providing data to requesting users comprising:

one or more server nodes connected to the network, at least one of which is input-ported for receiving data feeds and external data sources and output-ported for transmitting the data stripped from the feeds to the requesting users; (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40 and Col. 22 line 64 to Col. 23 line 10)

one or more instances of software executing on the one or more server nodes, the software for stripping the data from the feeds, and accepting information, including configuration information from users interfacing with the software by way of an Internet-capable appliance and supported platform; and (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

a mass storage repository accessible to the one or more server nodes, the data repository for storing the stripped data and for storing user profile and account data;

(see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

Internet-capable device (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 5-10)

Langseth fails to teach, wherein the system provides pre-programmed configuration templates to users for use in configuring at least part of the user profile for that user's Internet-capable appliance, enabling the system to send data for display to the user in the required format

Fields teaches, wherein the system provides pre-programmed configuration templates to users for use in configuring at least part of the user profile for that user's Internet-capable appliance, enabling the system to send data for display to the user in the required format. (see Fields, figures 5A,B, Col.3 lines 53-58, Col. 5 lines 33-65. Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 18)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the method of Langseth of stripping, saving and outputting with the pre-programmed template system of Fields in order to improve the disbursement of rapidly changing content. (see Langseth, Col. 1 lines 28-43) and (see Fields, Col. 1 lines 30-62)

3. For claim 45, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43 wherein the pre-programmed configuration templates include one or more drop down menus. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 43, applies equally as well to claim 45.

4. For claim 46, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 45 wherein the drop down menus include selections for market alerts for selected stocks, or selection for configuring the rendering of the stripped data for display on a particular user device for which data is intended. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

5. For claim 47, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein the network is the Internet network. (see Langseth, Col. 14 lines 32-43)

6. For claim 48, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein data transmitted to user is transmitted over a cooperating interfacing networks include one or a combination of a paging network, a wireless network, and a wireless Internet service network. (see Langseth, Col. 14 lines 44-58)

7. For claim 49, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein data transmitted comprises publicly oriented financial activity and news information. (see Langseth, Col. 14 lines 44-58)

8. For claim 52, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein data rendered to users is of the form of alerts triggered through detection of specific and

Art Unit: 2145

variable conditions associated with the data, the conditions configured into orders received from users. (see Langseth, Col. 3 lines 52-57)

9. For claim 53, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein data rendered to users further includes most recent real-time values associated with the requested data. (see Langseth, Col. 3 lines 25-27)

10. For claim 54, Langseth-Fields teaches, in a network-based system for providing data to requesting user, a software application for managing the function of the system, comprising:

a user-interface component for interfacing with users the purpose of accepting data about users and for accepting orders from users; (see Langseth, Col. 5 lines 1-8)

a source-interface component for receiving data feeds from external data sources, parsing data feeds for data pertinent to user orders, and for directing the parsed data into a data repository; (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

a database management component for managing database operations including associating appropriate data parsed through order to appropriate requesting users; (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 40-48 and Col. 14 lines 44-67)

wherein user are enabled through an electronic interactive interface of the software application to define personalized service profiles, utilizing pre-programmed templates provided by the system for specifically defining a profile for the user's Internet-capable device, enabling the system to send data for display in the required format of the Internet-capable device. (see Fields, figures 5A,B, Col.3 lines 53-58, Col. 5 lines 33-65. Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 18)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 43, applies equally as well to claim 54.

11. For claim 56, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54 wherein the pre-programmed configuration templates include one or more drop down menus. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

12. For claim 57, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 56 wherein the drop down menus include selections for market alerts for selected stocks, or selection for configuring the rendering of the stripped data for display on a particular user device for which data is intended. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 43, applies equally as well to claim 57.



Art Unit: 2145

13. For claim 58, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, wherein the network is the Internet network. (see Langseth, Col. 14 lines 32-43)

14. For claim 59, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, wherein the user-interface component is accessible through the Internet using an Internet-capable computing device, or via wireless data networks connected to the Internet. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 6-9 and Col. 9 lines 34-38)

15. For claim 60, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 59, wherein the Internet-capable computing device is a personal computer. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 6-9 and Col. 9 lines 34-38)

16. For claim 61, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 59, wherein the Internet-capable computing device is a hand-held computer. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 6-9 and Col. 9 lines 34-38)

17. For claim 62, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, distributed to a single server node in the case of one server node. (see Langseth, Col. 5 lines 17-32)

Art Unit: 2145

18. For claim 63, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, distributed to more than one server node in the case of more server nodes. (see Langseth, Col. 5 lines 17-32)

19. For claim 64, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, wherein data about users includes account data, contact data, device data, and portfolio data. (see Langseth, Col. 19 lines 24-34, Col. 4 lines 42-47 and Col. 4 lines 5-9)

20. For claim 65, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, wherein orders from users include conditional alert orders, time-sensitive alert orders, and event-driven alert orders. (see Langseth, Col. 3 lines 52-57)

21. For claim 66, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 54, wherein the source-interface component cooperates with the data-conversion component to affect data conversion before directing the parsed data into the data repository. (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

22. For claim 67, Langseth-Fields teaches, the software application of claim 66, wherein the user-interface component cooperates with the data-conversion component to affect data conversion to data about users before storing the data and to order data before storing and initiating execution of the data orders. (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

23. Claims 44, 50-51, 55, 68-81, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langseth-Fields as applied to claims 43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-67, 82-83, and 85-95 above, and further in view of Jamtgaard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,624, referred to as Jamtgaard).

24. For claim 44, Langseth-Fields teaches, the system of claim 43 wherein the user, through the interactive interface is further enabled to order and receive the stripped data in a usable presentation format personalized to each user (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65) (see Langseth, Col. 9 lines 7-12)

Langseth-Fields fails to clearly disclose, rendered to each user through a particular cooperation interface network to the particular wireless communication device operated by individual one of the users, the device configured for receiving the stripped data.

Jamtgaard teaches, rendered to each user through a particular cooperation interface network to the particular wireless communication device operated by individual one of the users, the device configured for receiving the stripped data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the stripping, storage, outputting and pre-programmed template system of Langseth-Fields with the rendering and transmitting to multiple

Art Unit: 2145

device types method of Jamtgaard in order to improve the "look and feel" of displaying content. (see Jamtgaard, Col. 2 lines 26-38) and (see Fields, Col. 1 lines 30-62)z

25. For claim 50, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein the wireless communication devices configured for receiving the data rendered by the system are one of a one-way pager, a two-way pager, a hand-held computing device, or a Web enabled telephone. (see Langseth, Col. 9 lines 34-38)

26. For claim 51, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the system of claim 43, wherein the data feed received from external data sources is parsed and converted into eXtensible Markup Language before being converted to the appropriate data format before being rendered. (see Jamtgaard, Col. 2 lines 63-67 and Col. 5 lines 60-64, RML is inherently eXtensible Markup Language)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 51.

27. For claim 55, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the software application of claim 54 wherein the user, through the interactive interface is further enabled to order and receive the stripped data in a usable presentation format personalized to each user and rendered to each user through a particular cooperation interface network to the particular wireless communication device operated by individual one of the users, the

Art Unit: 2145

device configured for receiving the stripped data. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65) (see Langseth, Col. 9 lines 7-12) (see Jamtgaard, Col. 7 lines 12-48)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 55.

28. For claim 68, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the software application of claim 67, wherein the data-conversion component converts data results from the common markup language to the appropriate data formats before initiating the data-transport component for delivering the data. (see Jamtgaard, Col. 2 lines 48-59)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 68.

29. For claim 69, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the software application of claim 68, wherein orders from users received through the user-interface component result in periodic data pushes to the device of the requesting user. (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 20-23)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 69.

Art Unit: 2145

30. For claim 70, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, software application of claim 69, wherein orders are received through bi-directional interface with the data-transport component, the orders comprising on-demand orders. (see Jamtgaard, Col. 2 lines 40-47)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 70.

31. For claim 71, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, a method for a service for transmitting data to requesting users connected by a data link, comprising steps of:

(a) receiving configuration information from a user defining a profile for the user's Internet-capable device, enabling the system to send data for display in the required format of the Internet-capable device, the information generated in part by the user operating a pre-programmed template provided by the service; (see Fields, figures 5A,B, Col.3 lines 53-58, Col. 5 lines 33-65. Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 18)

(b) receiving an order for data from a user, the user sending the order through the data link; (see Jamtgaard, Col. 7 lines 13-14)

(c) parsing a data feed identified in the received order, the data feed continually tapped by the service and the parsing performed to identify data in the feed that is requested by the order; (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

(d) stripping the portions of data from the data feed according to instructions contained in the order; (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

(e) associating the stripped portions of a data to the author of the order for the data; and (see Jamtgaard, Col. 7 lines 20-25)

(f) transporting the requested data to the user back over the data link, according to the profile definition in step a. (see Langseth, Col. 5 lines 24-32) and (see Fields, figures 5A,B, Col.3 lines 53-58, Col. 5 lines 33-65. Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 18)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 71.

32. For claim 72, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71 wherein the user, through the interactive interface is further enabled to order and receive the stripped data in a usable presentation format personalized to each user and rendered to each user through a particular cooperation interface network to the particular wireless communication device operated by individual one of the users, the

Art Unit: 2145

device configured for receiving the stripped data. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65) (see Langseth, Col. 9 lines 7-12) (see Jamtgaard, Col. 7 lines 12-48)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 72.

33. For claim 73, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71 wherein the pre-programmed configuration templates include one or more drop down menus. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

34. For claim 74, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 73 wherein the drop down menus include selections for market alerts for selected stocks, or selection for configuring the rendering of the stripped data for display on a particular user device for which data is intended. (see Fields, Col. 5 lines 33-65)

35. For claim 75, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71, wherein the feed is from Internet network and the data link comprises a wireless data link facilitated by a wireless service carrier. (see Langseth, Col. 5 lines 1-8, Col. 4 lines 5-10, Col. 14 lines 32-43)



Art Unit: 2145

36. For claim 76, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71 wherein the data link is one of a wireless data link, a pager network data link, or a wireless Internet data link. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 5-10)

37. For claim 77, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71 wherein the order is an on-demand order initiated through one of a one-way pager, a two-way pager, a handheld computing device, or the Web enabled wireless telephone. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 5-10)

38. For claim 78, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 77 wherein the data feed contains market activity information and the order requests the most current activity values associated with specific instruments reported by the feed. (see Langseth, Col. 3 lines 25-28 and Col. 14 lines 44-58)

39. For claim 79, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, a method of claim 78 wherein the data feed contains market news information and the order requests the most current news summaries as reported by the feed. (see Langseth, Col. 4 lines 42-47 and Col. 14 lines 44-58)

40. For claim 80, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 71, wherein instructions contained in the order pertain to one or more instruments generic to the data feed. (see Langseth, Col. 23 lines 34-40)

41. For claim 81, Langseth-Fields-Jamtgaard teaches, the method of claim 26, wherein steps (a)-(f) are repeated a plurality of times during one session on behalf of one user engaging in the session. (see Jamtgaard, Col. 5 lines 45-53)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 44, applies equally as well to claim 81.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason Cardone  
Supervisor Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2145

AB